arXiv:hep-ph/9911238v2 26 Jan 2000

DSF-T-99/36

Neutrino masses and mixings in $SO(10)$

M. Abud*, F. Buccella$^{*\circ}$, D. Falcone$^\circ$, G. Ricciardi$^\circ$ and F. Tramontano*

*Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli,
Mostra d'Oltremare, Pad. 19, I-80125, Napoli, Italy,
and INFN, Sezione di Napoli, Italy;
$^\circ$Istituto di Fisica Teorica, Università di Napoli, Italy

Assuming a Zee-like matrix for the right-handed neutrino Majorana masses in the see-saw mechanism, one gets maximal mixing for vacuum solar oscillations, a very small value for U_{e3} and an approximate degeneracy for the two lower neutrino masses. The scale of right-handed neutrino Majorana masses is in good agreement with the value expected in a $SO(10)$ model with Pati-Salam $SU(4)\times SU(2)\times SU(2)$ intermediate symmetry.

The evidence for neutrino oscillation, a phenomenon discussed many years ago [1], in solar [2] and atmospheric [3] neutrinos, with square mass differences smaller than $1(eV)^2$, has stimulated the search for theoretical framework [4]. Unified theories with $SO(10)$ as a gauge group [5] are a natural choice, since there one expects neutrinos to be much lighter than the other fermions as a consequence of the see-saw mechanism [6].

$SO(10)$ is a suitable framework to discuss fermion masses, because all the left(right)-handed fermions of each family belong to a single irreducible representation, namely the spinorial **16** ($\overline{\mathbf{16}}$). However, the spectrum and the mixing (the CKM matrix) of the fermions do not show a clear $SO(10)$ pattern. In fact, by assuming that the electroweak Higgs belongs to a single real **10** representation, one gets the same spectrum for the charge $\frac{2}{3}$ and $-\frac{1}{3}$ quarks (and at the $SO(10)$ unification scale also for the Dirac neutrino and charged lepton masses) and a trivial CKM matrix. This last prediction can be thought as a zero order approximation in an expansion in $\lambda = \sin(\theta_c)$, but in order to account for the large difference between m_t and m_b, at least one needs to assume that the two directions of the **10** with vanishing colour and electric charge have VEV's not belonging to the same real **10** representations. In absence of components of the electroweak VEV along representations higher than **10** one keeps the equalities at the $SO(10)$ scale of the quark with charge $-\frac{1}{3}$ and of the charged lepton mass matrix, as well for the quark with charge $\frac{2}{3}$ and the Dirac neutrino mass matrices. In that case one would have the same mixings for the quark and the Dirac lepton mass matrix and, especially for the two heaviest families, we can neglect the mixing of Dirac leptons ($V_{cb} \simeq 0.04$).

The effective Majorana mass matrix for the light left-handed neutrinos is given by:

$$M_\nu^{(L)} = -M_D^T M_\nu^{(R)-1} M_D. \tag{1}$$

$M_\nu^{(R)}$ has to be symmetric and if we assume, for simplicity, CP symmetry, it is a real matrix

$$M_\nu^{(R)} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & \rho & \nu \\ \rho & M_2 & \mu \\ \nu & \mu & M_3, \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

The Dirac mass matrix M_D is assumed real and diagonal, according to our approximation of neglecting the mixings:

$$M_D = \begin{pmatrix} M^D_{\nu_e} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M^D_{\nu_\mu} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M^D_{\nu_\tau} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

From the previous equations it is easy to get

$$M^{(L)}_\nu = -\frac{1}{D} \begin{pmatrix} (M_2 M_3 - \mu^2)\left(M^D_{\nu_e}\right)^2 & (\mu\nu - M_3\rho)\, M^D_{\nu_e} M^D_{\nu_\mu} & (\rho\mu - M_2\nu)\, M^D_{\nu_e} M^D_{\nu_\tau} \\ (\mu\nu - M_3\rho)\, M^D_{\nu_e} M^D_{\nu_\mu} & (M_1 M_3 - \nu^2)\left(M^D_{\nu_\mu}\right)^2 & (\rho\nu - M_1\mu)\, M^D_{\nu_\mu} M^D_{\nu_\tau} \\ (\rho\mu - M_2\nu)\, M^D_{\nu_e} M^D_{\nu_\tau} & (\rho\nu - M_1\mu)\, M^D_{\nu_\mu} M^D_{\nu_\tau} & (M_1 M_2 - \rho^2)\left(M^D_{\nu_\tau}\right)^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where

$$D \equiv \det M^{(R)}_\nu = M_1 M_2 M_3 + 2\rho\nu\mu - M_1\mu^2 - M_2\nu^2 - M_3\rho^2. \tag{5}$$

Let us make the approximation of neglecting $M^D_{\nu_e}$ with respect to the Dirac masses of the other neutrinos, which may be reasonable if the electroweak doublet has components only along **10** representations, which would imply

$$M_D = \frac{m_\tau}{m_b} M_{q=\frac{2}{3}}, \tag{6}$$

but may hold more generally, since all the charged fermions of the first family have masses smaller than those of the other two families. In that limit the matrix elements of the first row and of the first column of eq.(4) vanish and the remaining 2×2 matrix has the property of having a vanishing eigenvalue if one takes only the contributions proportional to ν^2, $\nu\rho$ and ρ^2. Since one of the solutions for the neutrino spectrum is the hierarchical one with the highest mass $\simeq \frac{1}{16}\ eV$, we conclude that it is an intriguing possibility to have only non-diagonal matrix elements in $M^{(R)}_\nu$. A matrix with this property has been proposed many years ago by Zee [7] for left-handed neutrinos and its phenomenological consequences have been discussed by Frampton and Glashow [8] in the case of light Majorana neutrinos. We also assume a non-vanishing μ in order to have $D \neq 0$. We define

$$A_e = \mu M^D_{\nu_e} = M_0^2 \sin\beta \tag{7}$$

$$A_\mu = \nu M^D_{\nu_\mu} = M_0^2 \cos\beta \cos\alpha \tag{8}$$

$$A_\tau = \rho M^D_{\nu_\tau} = -M_0^2 \cos\beta \sin\alpha \tag{9}$$

and get

$$M_\nu^{(L)} = \frac{1}{D} \begin{pmatrix} A_e^2 & -A_e A_\mu & -A_e A_\tau \\ -A_e A_\mu & A_\mu^2 & -A_\mu A_\tau \\ -A_e A_\tau & -A_\mu A_\tau & A_\tau^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \frac{M_0^4}{D} \begin{pmatrix} \sin^2\beta & -\sin\beta\cos\beta\cos\alpha & \sin\beta\cos\beta\sin\alpha \\ -\sin\beta\cos\beta\cos\alpha & \cos^2\beta\cos^2\alpha & \cos^2\beta\cos\alpha\sin\alpha \\ \sin\beta\cos\beta\sin\alpha & \cos^2\beta\cos\alpha\sin\alpha & \cos^2\beta\sin^2\alpha \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

whose eigenvalues obey the secular equation

$$m_i^3 - m_i^2 \frac{A_e^2 + A_\mu^2 + A_\tau^2}{D} + \frac{4A_e^2 A_\mu^2 A_\tau^2}{D^3} = 0 \qquad (i = 1, 2, 3). \tag{11}$$

The absence of the linear term in eq.(11) implies for the three solutions the relation

$$m_1 m_2 + m_1 m_3 + m_2 m_3 = 0. \tag{12}$$

If m_3 is larger than the other two solutions, one has that m_1 and m_2 are almost opposite, more precisely

$$m_1 + m_2 = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{m_3}. \tag{13}$$

The ratios of the solutions of eq.(11) depend on the quantity

$$k^2 = \frac{4A_e^2 A_\mu^2 A_\tau^2}{\left(A_e^2 + A_\mu^2 + A_\tau^2\right)^3} = \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 2\alpha \sin^2 2\beta \cos^2\beta \tag{14}$$

which should be small in order to have one solution larger than the other two. In this case one has approximately, to lowest order in k

$$m_3 \simeq \frac{A_e^2 + A_\mu^2 + A_\tau^2}{D} = \frac{M_0^4}{D} \tag{15}$$

$$|m_1| \simeq |m_2| \simeq \frac{2A_e A_\mu A_\tau}{D\sqrt{A_e^2 + A_\mu^2 + A_\tau^2}} = k\frac{M_0^4}{D} \tag{16}$$

and

$$m_1 + m_2 \simeq \frac{4A_e^2 A_\mu^2 A_\tau^2}{D\left(A_e^2 + A_\mu^2 + A_\tau^2\right)^2} = k^2\frac{M_0^4}{D} \tag{17}$$

which imply

$$m_{1,2} \simeq k\frac{M_0^4}{D}\left(\mp 1 + \frac{k}{2}\right) \tag{18}$$

and

$$m_2^2 - m_1^2 = 2k^3\frac{M_0^8}{D^2}. \tag{19}$$

Under these assumptions, m_3^2 and $m_2^2 - m_1^2$ have to be identified with the values of Δm^2_{atm} and Δm^2_{sun}, the quantities that are relevant for the oscillations of the atmospheric and solar neutrinos. The parameter k is so recovered to be

$$k^3 = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Delta m^2_{sun}}{\Delta m^2_{atm}}. \tag{20}$$

The absence of the distortion (which is predicted by the MSW solution) of the spectrum, according to the new data of SuperKamiokande with a lower threshold (5 MeV) for the electron detection, has brought Bilenky, Giunti and Grimus [9] to consider the vacuum solution as the most probable with the following parameters

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{atm} = 1, \quad \Delta m^2_{atm} = 3.5{\times}10^{-3}\,\mathrm{eV}. \tag{21}$$

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{sun} = 0.8, \quad \Delta m^2_{sun} = 4.3{\times}10^{-10}\,\mathrm{eV}. \tag{22}$$

From eq.(20),(21) and (22) we get

$$k = 4{\times}10^{-3}. \tag{23}$$

In order to have a small value for k, at least one of the A's defined in eqs.(7),(8) and (9) should be smaller than the others. The most natural choice is A_e, since it is proportional to the Dirac mass of ν_e, that corresponds to a small value for the β angle. In this case $k \simeq \beta \sin 2\alpha$, and we are naturally brought to a small value for U_{e3} and to a large value for the angle intervening in the solar neutrino oscillations.

In fact, the exact eigenvalues of eq.(11) are

$$m_3 = \frac{M_0^4}{D}\left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3}\cos\psi\right) \tag{24}$$

$$m_{2,1} = \frac{M_0^4}{D}\left[\frac{1}{3}(1-\cos\psi) \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\sin\psi\right] \tag{25}$$

with ψ given by

$$\cos 3\psi = 1 - \frac{27}{2}k^2. \tag{26}$$

The corresponding eigenvectors, in terms of $\lambda_i = m_i \frac{D}{M_0^4}$ are given by

$$a_i \begin{pmatrix} 2\lambda_i(\lambda_i - \cos^2\beta) \\ \sin 2\beta \cos\alpha(-\lambda_i + 2\cos^2\beta \sin^2\alpha) \\ \sin 2\beta \sin\alpha(\lambda_i - 2\cos^2\beta\cos^2\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \tag{27}$$

where the a_i are the appropriate normalization factors, to have unit norm vectors. Developing in the small parameter β, to lowest order, we get:

$$|U_{e3}| \simeq \beta \cos 2\alpha \simeq k \cot 2\alpha \tag{28}$$

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{sun} = \frac{4U_{e1}^2 U_{e2}^2}{(|U_{e1}|^2 + |U_{e2}|^2)^2} \simeq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{4}\right) + O(k^3). \tag{29}$$

For small k, the mixing angle for atmospheric neutrinos may be identified with α and the high value for $\sin^2 2\theta_{atm}$ implies a very small value for $|U_{e3}|$, well below the limit $|U_{e3}|^2 < 0.05$ [10], from the CHOOZ experiment [11]. Eq. (29) implies that $\sin^2 2\theta_{sun}$ is practically equal to the maximal value.

For $\alpha = \pi/4$ one has, exactly to all orders, $U_{e3} = 0$ and maximal mixing for atmospheric neutrinos. In that case the mixing matrix, in the limit $k = 0$, is the one with bimaximal mixing proposed in ref. [12,13]

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{30}$$

A scenario similar to the one proposed here can be found in ref. [14] with an appropriate choice of the Dirac neutrino mass and an antidiagonal form for the Majorana mass matrix for right-handed neutrinos (in our notation with only ν and M_2 different from zero). Also in that paper the ratio of the scales for solar and atmospheric neutrino oscillations are given in terms of an expansion parameter in such a way that, when it vanishes gives also rise to the bimaximal mixing (30). Also there the two lower mass neutrino eigenstates are almost degenerate. The resulting matrices for the two cases are different as well the secular equation for the mass eigenstates, which brings to a value for the mass of the almost degenerate lighter neutrinos $\sqrt[3]{2}$ larger than the value given in ref. [14], a difference which unfortunately seems very far from experimental detection. Another difference concerns the matrix element M_{ee}, which appears in the double β-decay, which is predicted to vanish in [14], but as we shall see later, the non-vanishing value predicted here is completely negligible for the vacuum solution.

It is the right moment to remind that we have neglected the rotation between the charged lepton and the Dirac neutrino mass matrices. This approximation is reasonable if we assume that electroweak Higgs has components only along **10** representations of $SO(10)$ since in that case this solution is given by the CKM matrix, which has small non-diagonal matrix elements. We are aware that the inequality $m_\mu m_b > m_\tau m_s$ requires some component of the electroweak Higgs along some higher representation [15].

In $SO(10)$ the scale for the right-handed neutrino masses is related to the scale of $B - L$ symmetry breaking [16] and therefore it is interesting to see which values of μ, ν, ρ are needed to get the values of Δm^2_{atm} and Δm^2_{sun}. To the purpose of getting the right order of magnitude, one can assume eq.(6) and $\alpha = \pi/4$, which implies the value of μ

$$\mu = \left(\frac{m_\tau}{m_b}\right)^2 \frac{m_c m_t}{m_3} \simeq 7.5{\times}10^{11}\ GeV. \tag{31}$$

We have taken $m_3 = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{atm}} = 6{\times}10^{-2}$ eV and, as reference values, the masses at the scale M_Z: $m_u = 2.3{\times}10^{-3}$ GeV, $m_c = 0.67$ GeV, $m_b = 3.0$ GeV, $m_t = 181$ GeV and $m_\tau = 1.75$ GeV [17]. Anyway, since our quantities depend only on the ratios of the quark masses, a strong dependence on the scale is not expected.

We also have

$$\nu = \mu \frac{m_u}{m_c} \frac{A_\mu}{A_e} = 4.6{\times}10^{11}\text{GeV}, \tag{32}$$

$$\rho = \nu \frac{m_c}{m_t} = 1.7{\times}10^{9}\text{GeV}. \tag{33}$$

The rather moderate values for the matrix elements of $M_\nu^{(R)}$ are a consequence of the approximate degeneracy of the two lower neutrino mass eigenstate, which makes

$$m_{1,2} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m^2_{sun}}{2}} \left(\frac{2\Delta m^2_{atm}}{\Delta m^2_{sun}}\right)^{1/6} \gg \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{sun}} \tag{34}$$

while with the hierarchical relationship $m_2 > m_1$ one should have

$$m_1 \ll m_2 \simeq \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{sun}}, \tag{35}$$

and the opposite inequality with respect to eq.(34). In fact from the eqs.(1),(2),(5) and (6), and $m_3 \simeq \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{atm}}$, one would get

$$D = \frac{R^3 m_u^2 m_c^2 m_t^2}{m_1 m_2 m_3} \simeq 2{\times}10^{35} \frac{\Delta m^2_{sun}}{m_1 m_2}\ GeV^3 \tag{36}$$

($R = (m_\tau/m_b)^2$) and the inequality (34) brings to a lower value for D. Also the approximate degeneracy between m_2 and m_1 allows to get a not too broad neutrino mass spectrum.

For the first diagonal matrix elements of the Majorana mass one finds as order of magnitude

$$M_{ee} = \frac{k m_u^2 \mu}{2\rho\nu} \sim 1.2\times 10^{-6} eV; \tag{37}$$

much smaller than the present experimental limit (0.2 eV) [18].

It is worth to recall that a value $\simeq 2.8\times 10^{11}$ GeV has been found [19] for the scale of spontaneous breaking of $B-L$ in the $SO(10)$ model with $SU(4)\times SU(2)\times SU(2)$ intermediate symmetry [20], which is broken by a VEV of the **126** representation, endowed with the right quantum numbers to give Majorana masses to the right-handed neutrino. Above that scale, $SU(4)_{PS}$ for quarks and leptons implies that their mass ratios do not change. The narrow range for the evolution of m_b/m_τ is not enough to get $m_b = m_\tau$ at that scale [21] as required by the hypothesis that the electroweak Higgs VEV's are only along **10** representations, but at least a smaller contribution from other representation is needed with respect to the case where the range of RGE for the mass ratio extends to the unification scale, at which the lepto-quarks responsible for proton decay take their mass.

As a conclusion we think that the choice of the Zee matrix [7] for the right-handed neutrino Majorana masses seems very appealing for the vacuum solution of the solar neutrino problem and well consistent with the scale found in the $SO(10)$ model with Pati-Salam intermediate symmetry.

One of us (F. B.) gratefully acknowledges stimulating discussions with Profs. Z. Berezhiani and A. Masiero.

---

[1] B. Pontecorvo, JETP **53**, 1717 (1967); V. Gribov and B. Pontecorvo, Phys. Lett. B **28**, 493 (1969).

[2] B.Pontecorvo, Report PD-205 National Research Council of Canada,Division of Atomic Energy, Chalk River (1946). R. Davis Jr *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20**, 1205 (1968); Homestake Coll.: R. Davis Jr *et al.* Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **32**,13 (1994); Gallex Coll.: P. Anselmann

et al. Phys. Lett. B **342**, 440 (1995); W. Hampel *et al*., Phys. Lett. B **447**, 127 (1999); Sage Coll.: J. N. Abdurashitov *et al*. Phys. Lett. B **328**, 234 (1994); Kamiokande Coll.: Y. Fukuda *et al*., Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1683 (1996); SuperKamiokande Coll.: Y. Fukuda *et al*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1158 (1998).

[3] Kamiokande Coll.: K.S.Hirata *et al*., Phys. Lett. B **205**, 416 (1998); B **280**, 145 (1998); M.B.Cooper *et al*., Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2561 (1991); R. Becker-Szendy *et al*., Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3720 (1992); SuperKamiokande Coll.: Y. Fukuda *et al*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 397 (1998); Macro Coll.: M. Ambrosio *et al*, Phys. Lett. B **343**, 451 (1998), see also *Neutrino* 98, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **77** (1999).

[4] J.K. Elwood, N. Irges and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5064 (1998); K. Oda, E. Takasugi, M. Tanaka and M. Yoshimura, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 055001 (1999); K. Hagiwara and N. Okamura, Nucl. Phys. B **548**, 60 (1999); G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Phys. Lett. B **451**, 388 (1999); Z. Berezhiani and A. Rossi, JHEP **03**, 002 (1999); C.H. Albright, K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1167 (1998); J. Ellis, G.K. Leontaris, S. Lola and D.V. Nanopoulos, Eur. Phys. J. C **9**, 389 (1999); M. Fukugita, M. Tanimoto and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 113016 (1999); H. Fritzsch and Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **440**, 313 (1998); K. Matsuda, T. Fukuyama and H. Nishiura, hep-ph/9906433; B. Stech, Phys. Lett. B **465**, 219 (1999).

[5] H. Georgi, in *Particles and Fields* (AIP, New York, 1975); H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, Ann. Phys. **93**, 193 (1975).

[6] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979); T. Yanagida, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Number in the Universe*, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK, 1979).

[7] A. Zee, Phys. Lett. B **93**, 389 (1980).

[8] P. H. Frampton and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Lett. B **461**, 95 (1999).

[9] S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti, W. Grimus, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **43**, 1 (1999).

[10] S. M. Bilenky and C. Giunti, Phys. Lett. B **444**, 379 (1998); S.T. Petcov, hep-ph/9907216, to appear in the Proc. of Int. Workshop on Weak Interactions on Neutrinos (WIN 99).

[11] M. Apollonio *et al.*, CHOOZ Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **420**, 397 (1998).

[12] F. Vissani, hep-ph/9708483; A. T. Baltz, A. S. Goldhaber and M. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5730 (1998); V. Barger, S. Pakvasa, T. J. Weiler and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. B **437**, 107 (1998).

[13] Y. Nomura and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 017303 (1999); G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Phys. Lett. B **439**, 112 (1998); H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow, hep-ph/9808293; S.K. Kang and C.S. Kim, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 091302 (1999); C.H. Albright and S.M. Barr, Phys. Lett. B **461**, 218 (1999).

[14] M. Jezabek and Y. Sumino, Phys. Lett. B **440**, 327 (1998).

[15] J. Harvey, D.B. Reiss and P. Ramond, Nucl. Phys. B **199**, 223 (1982).

[16] D. Chang, R.N. Mohapatra, J. Gipson, R.E. Marshak and M.K. Parida, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 1718 (1985); G. M. Gipson and R. E. Marshak, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 1705 (1985); F. Buccella, L. Cocco, A. Sciarrino and T. Tuzi, Nucl. Phys. B **274**, 559 (1986); F. Acampora, G. Amelino-Camelia, F. Buccella, O. Pisanti, L. Rosa and T. Tuzi, Nuovo Cimento A **108**, 375 (1995).

[17] H. Fusaoka and Y. Koide, Phys. Rev D **57**, 3986 (1998).

[18] L. Baudis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 41 (1999).

[19] N. G. Deshpande, E. Keith and B. P. Pal, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 2261 (1992); O. Pisanti and L. Rosa, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **40**, 81 (1998); F. Buccella and O. Pisanti, hep-ph/9910447.

[20] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 275 (1974).

[21] H. Arason, D.J. Castano, E.J. Piard and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 232 (1993).